13th November 1922]

(6) Mr. Pattabhiramayya was chairman of the union from 1916–1919. During the latter part of this period certain delays in the collection and remittance of the money due to the union were noticed. The then president of the district board recorded the papers as the whole amount due to the union board was fully collected and remitted into the treasury and as he considered that there were several extenuating circumstances in the affair Mr. Pattabhiramayya resigned his membership and it was duly accepted. The Government have no information regarding the resignation of his membership in the Saidapet taluk board and the Chingleput district board.

(7) Mr. Pattabhiramayya's name does not find a place in the electoral roll prepared and published in February 1922. He filed a suit alleging that his name had been maliciously omitted; but the suit was dismissed. The Government understand that Mr. Pattabhiramayya has again resigned his membership in the union.

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"With reference to the answer given to clause (4) of this question, I should like to alter the answer by prefixing the words 'the Government are informed that'."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"Sir, I want to know what the test of suitability of a Muhammadan candidate is. Is it appearance or wealth?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"There are many qualifications. In the first place the candidate must not be disqualified according to the disqualifications given in the Act. Many other qualifications are necessary for a successful candidate."

Representation of the depressed classes in the taluk boards of the South Arcot district.

447 *Q.*—Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(1) whether there is at least one representative of the depressed classes in each of the taluk boards in the South Arcot district;

(2) whether it is a fact that the Chidambaram taluk board has no representative of the depressed classes;

(3) whether there was at any time a representative of this community on the Chidambaram taluk board; what became of him and whether it is not a fact that one Reddi was appointed in his place; and

(4) whether qualified members of the Adi-Dravida community were available for nomination at the time of nomination; and, if so, why their claims were overlooked?

A.—(1) & (2) There is one representative of the depressed classes in each of the taluk boards of Tirukkoyilur, Tindivanam and Vriddhachalam and none in the Chidambaram or Cuddalore taluk boards.

(3) & (4) The Government have no information.